DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 434 JC 870 060

AUTHOR Carfagna-Hunt, Karen; And Others
TITLE Los Angeles Community College District Campus Child Development Centers' Measures of Effectiveness Project. Second Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1983-1984.
INSTITUTION Los Angeles County Office of Education, Downey, CA.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 83p.; For the first evaluation report, see ED 224 508.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Ancillary School Services; *Child Development Centers; Community Colleges; Educational Assessment; Educational Facilities; Evaluation Methods; Institutional Evaluation; Participant Satisfaction; Peer Evaluation; *Preschool Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) provides a Campus Child Development Center (CCDC) educational program for the preschool children of its college students at all nine of its campuses. In 1983-84, on-site, peer review team visits were conducted to evaluate the centers in terms of their achievement of six program objectives. The objectives related to: (1) enhancing access to higher education and job training for the student-parent; (2) serving as a field training site for all academic departments; (3) functioning as an early childhood education program for children of college students; (4) maintaining an exemplary community college campus-based child development center program; (5) offering a parent involvement program to enhance parenting skills; and (6) expanding and enhancing existing child development services. The evaluation team was composed of two program directors, two instructors, and the county evaluation consultant. This evaluation report begins with information on the original intent and future plans for the district's CCDC program, states the CCDC philosophy, and describes the centers. Next, program evaluation results are detailed by program objective, providing information on personnel responsible, the tasks involved in achieving the objectives, and the measures to be used to assess the accomplishment of the tasks. Special commendations are given to programs with outstanding achievements. Next, program evaluation results are provided for each of the nine LACCD campuses. A survey instrument for parents and census report are appended. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. SIMONE
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EVALUATION REPORT

ED277434

LACCD CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS'

MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS PROJECT
Second Evaluation Report
(Fiscal Year 1983-84)
Final Copy
Prepared and Distributed by:

Donald L. Kester, Ph.D.
Program Evaluation Consultant
Division of Evaluation, Attendance,
and Pupil Services

IC 870 060

Educational Program Evaluation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Los Angeles County Office of Education

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS' MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS PROJECT

SECOND EVALUATION REPORT

(Fiscal Year 1983-1984)

BY

Karen Carfagna-Hunt, CCDC Instructor
Los Angeles Trade Technical College

Alice Hernandez, CCDC Director
Los Angeles Mission College

Donald Kester, Ph.D., Evaluation Consultant
Los Angeles County Office of Education

Kathy Lally, CCDC Instructor
Los Angeles Pierce College

and

Michael Simone, CCDC Director
East Los Angeles College

Published by

The Division of Evaluation, Attendance, and Pupil Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Dr. Gordon Footman, director
1986

Los Angeles County Office of Education

9300 East Imperial Highway
Downey, California 90242-2890

Stuart E. Gothold, *superintendent*

Los Angeles County Board of Education

Daniel L. Towler, *president*
Mary E. Lewis, *vice president*
Frank J. Alderete
Ruth Bloom
Lawrence J. Kaplan, D.D.S., F.I.C.D.
Earl V Pullias
Michaelene D. Wagner

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS'

MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS PROJECT

SECOND PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT

(Fiscal Year 1983 - 1984)

FOR

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND ADMINISTRATION

(As of 1983)

Marguerite A. Hudson, President

Arthur Bronson, Vice President

Wallace Albertson, member

Lindsay Conner, member

Harold W. Garvin, member

Monroe F. Richman, M.D., member

Rich Tuttle, member

Judy Gomez, student member

Dr. Leslie Koltai, Chancellor

Dr. Kenneth S. Washington, Vice Chancellor
Educational Services

David Agosto, Director
Student Services

Victoria Richart, District Coordinator
Student Programs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction. 1

Acknowledgements. 2

Original Intention and Future Plans. 7

Campus Child Development Center Philosophy. 8

Campus Child Development Center Program Description. 9

The External Consultant's Preface on How to Read This Evaluation Report. 10

Definitions. 12

Program Evaluation Results By Program Objective

Objective 1.1 ". . . Gather Needed Feedback Information. . . " . . . 15

Objective 1.2 ". . . Children's Service Hours. . . " 16

Objective 1.3 ". . . Encourage Student/Parents to Enroll. . . and Persist. . . " 17

Objective 1.4 ". . . Estimate Increased Unit Load. . . " 18

Objective 2.1 ". . . Facilitate Use. . . as a Practicum Site. . . " 19

Objective 2.2 ". . . Facilitate Use. . . as an Observation Site. . " 20

Objective 2.3 ". . . Serve as a Resource Liaison. . ." 21

Objective 3.1 ". . . Cognitive, Affective, Social, Physical Growth" 22

Objective 3.2 ". . . Curriculum Components. . . " 23

Objective 4.1 ". . . Maintain. . .Exemplary Field Training Site. ." 24

Objective 4.2 ". . . Exemplary. . . Affective, Cognitive, Social and Motor Competencies. . ." 25

Page

Objective 4.3 ". . . Growth Opportunities. . . Faculty and Staff. ." 26

Objective 5.1 ". . . Keep Parents Informed. . ." 27

Objective 5.2 ". . . Involve the Parents. . ." 28

Objective 5.3 ". . . Provide Support to Student/Parents. . ." . . . 29

Objective 6.1 ". . . Districtwide. . .Masterplan. . ." 30

Objective 6.2 ". . . Identify Unmet Student/Parent Needs. . ." . . . 31

Objective 6.3 ". . . Explore Alternate Solutions. . ." 32

Objective 6.4 ". . . Implement New Programs. . ." 33

Objective 6.5 ". . . Integrate the. ..Center. . .Into Campus-Wide Activities. . ." 34

Program Evaluation Results By Each of the Nine Campuses

East Los Angeles College. 36

Los Angeles City College. 38

Los Angeles Harbor College. 39

Los Angeles Mission College 40

Los Angeles Pierce College. 41

Los Angeles Southwest College. 43

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College 46

Los Angeles Valley College. 47

West Los Angeles College. 48

Summary. 49

Conclusion 53

Appendix A - Parent Survey. 55

Appendix B - Census Report. 57

INTRODUCTION

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) provides an Educational Campus Child Development Center (CCDC) program for the preschool children of its college students at all nine of its campuses. Over the last few years, as the district was forced to cope with reduced funding levels in many areas, some district administrators followed the district chancellor's lead and called for greater accountability from specific programs. In the fall of the 1980-81 academic year, the District Coordinator of Student Programs, Victoria Richart, began strongly pressing the nine Campus Child Development Center directors to operationalize and evaluate their program. The Coordinator, who is skilled in evaluation, assisted with the early planning and called in an outside evaluation consultant to work directly with the directors.

In the winter of 1980-81, the nine directors selected their Evaluation Plan Writing Subcommittee. That writing team worked for several months writing and rewriting goals and measurable objectives. In the fall of the 1981-82 academic year the writing team brought their product back to the district's Child Development Center Coordinating Committee. With minor revisions the first evaluation plan was approved. During the spring of 1981-82, on-site evaluation review team visits were made to all nine Campus Child Development Centers.

The results of those nine peer-review, evaluation team visits were presented in a districtwide Child Development Center Program Evaluation Report which was circulated within the district and presented at a number of conferences. In addition, the report was accepted into the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) system. The title and access number are "SHOWING OFF WHAT WE DO AND HOW WELL WE DO IT; or how the Child Development Center Program at nine Los Angeles Community Colleges demonstrates accountability" (ED 224 508).

As a result of experiences related to that first districtwide CCDC program assessment, the Coordinating Committee again made minor revisions in the evaluation plan and scheduled a second series of on-site evaluation team visits for the fall of 1983-1984. This second evaluation report is based on what was observed during those team visits.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The CCDC evaluation system and evaluation reports would not exist were it not for the fact that support for them came from many people in various locations within the district.

At the District Level

At the LACC district level two administrators need to be acknowledged: Dr. Peter McDougall, currently superintendent of Santa Barbara Community College district and formerly an LACCD administrator, and Victoria Richart. It was Dr. McDougall who initiated the district's student services "Measures of Effectiveness" (MOE) project which in turn directly led to the inception of this CCDC evaluation system. (For a more complete description of the MOE effort which began with a 1980 "call for accountability" by the district's chancellor, Dr. Leslie Koltai, and proceeded to involve many LACCD people -- please see ERIC document number ED 247 977. The MOE project concerned all student service areas, only one of which was the Campus Child Development Centers program.) Upon Dr. McDougal's departure to Santa Barbara, district level operational support for the CCDC Evaluation was assumed by Victoria Richart, then district coordinator of student programs, and currently Academic Dean, Los Angeles Southwest College. She continued to involve Dr. Donald L. Kester, an evaluation consultant from the Los Angeles County Office of Education.

At the Campus Level

At the time of the second program evaluation the nine Campus Child Development Center program directors and acting directors were as follows.

o Kathi Cliff, Acting director
  Los Angeles Southwest College

- Karen Crummer, Director
  Los Angeles Harbor College

- Elizabeth Evans, Acting Director
  Los Angeles Trade-Technical College

- Alice Hernandez, Director
  Los Angeles Mission College

- Kathy McCreary, Director
  Los Angeles Valley College

- Erika Rosemark, Director
  Los Angeles Pierce College

- Michael Simone, Director
  East Los Angeles College

- Yvonne Hatfield, Director
  West Los Angeles College

- Jane Zukerman, Acting Director
  Los Angeles City College

As mentioned earlier, the initial CCDC Evaluation Plan was written by a subcommittee of volunteers from among the nine campus directors. That original plan (developed in the winter of 1980-1981) was written by a team of six:

- Karen Crummer, writing team chair

- Yvonne Hatfield, writing team member

- Dr. Donald Kester, writing team member

- Erika Rosemark, writing team member

o Michael Simone, writing team member

o Leanna Watts, writing team member

The five directors listed above also acted as "Lead Peer Evaluators" during the first series (spring of 1981-1982) of on-site evaluation visits to the nine Campus Child Development Centers. (For the full report please see the ERIC document ED 224 508.)

During the first series of evaluation visits the director whose program was to be visited was given the choice of which one or two of his or her colleagues (other directors) would act as "lead peer evaluator(s)" during the visit to his or her center. For example, Erika Rosemark (director at Pierce) and Leanna Watt (director at City) were "lead peer evaluators" during the evaluation team's visit to Los Angeles Mission College. Similarly, Yvonne Hatfield (director at West), and Michael Simone (director at East) acted as "lead peer evaluators" during the evaluation team's visit to Los Angeles Trade Technical College; and Karen Crummer (director at Harbor) was the "lead peer evaluator" during the team's visit to West Los Angeles College. The role of the "lead peer evaluator" was to act as chair of the team, resolve any disagreement between team members, and in general lead the team through the evaluation.

While this arrangement seemed to work well, especially during the directors' first experience with the evaluation procedure, they decided that for the second series of on-site visits (fall 1983-84) they would make two changes. First, they wanted all "single site" and "double site" campus programs to be seen by the same team members. In addition, they wanted to involve instructors from both "double" and "single" sites. (A "double site" was one that served twice as many children and student parents because it either had a second building or otherwise had twice the physical space of a "single site".)

For the second series (fall 1983-84) of on-site evaluation visits, the evaluation team was composed of two directors, one double site instructor, one single site instructor, and the county evaluation consultant. The newly

constituted evaluation team included the following members.

- Karen Carfagna, Instructor
  Los Angeles Trade Technical College
  (A single site)

- Alice Hernandez, Director
  Los Angeles Mission College

- Dr. Donald L. Kester, Evaluation Consultant
  Los Angeles County Office of Education

- Kathy Lally, Instructor
  Los Angeles Pierce College
  (A double site)

- Michael Simone, Director
  East Los Angeles College

In summary, special recognition is given to:

- Dr. Leslie Koltai, district chancellor, who initially sounded the clarion call for program accountability.

- Dr. Peter McDougall for initiating the district's "Measures of Effectiveness" project which sought to develop an accountability system for all district level student service programs.

- Victoria Richart who provided district level support not only the development of CCDC goals and objectives but also for the regular use of peer evaluation team visits to generate regular evaluation reports.

- All nine directors who decided to develop CCDC goals and objectives; who proceeded to schedule two series of on-site evaluation team visits; and who revised the evaluation system as needed.

- The writing teams that wrote and rewrote the evaluation plans.

- The lead peer evaluators and other evaluation team members who participated in the first series of on-site evaluation team visits (spring 1981-1982) and wrote the first Evaluation Report.

- Karen Carfagna, Alice Hernandez, Dr. Donald Kester, Kathy Lally, and Michael Simone who comprised the evaluation team which made the second series of on-site evaluation visits and wrote this evaluation report.

- The Deans and Assistant Deans of Student Services at various campuses who attended and participateed in the on-site reviews.

- Dr. Donald Kester, Consultant, for writing the "How to Read. . ." section of this report. Furthermore, for sharing his knowledge, time, and patience.

The nine CCDC directors also wish to gratefully acknowledge the continuing support for this program by the members of the board and the chancellor. In fact, the decision by the directors to develop an accountability system was based in part on their desire to provide a supportive administration and board with evidence of program effectiveness that could be used by them to answer any person or group that might argue for reducing or eliminating the program.

The directors believed that they owed it to the program's supporters to provide them with whatever was needed to defend the program. Seen from the directors' viewpoint, the development of the evaluation plan and the two evaluation reports was one way they chose of saying "Thank you" to the board and chancellor.

Finally, appreciation goes to Mrs. Blanche T. Malek-Mikhail, Dr. Kester's secretary, who typed this report in its final form.

ORIGINAL INTENTION AND FUTURE PLANS

In February 1975, the district opened the Campus Child Development Center's program with the intention that it should be an exemplary or model program. The evaluation system used in this evaluation report provides an operational definition of the district-level Campus Child Development Center program model as it currently exists. However, a major review of the current goals and objectives is planned for the 1986-1987 academic year.

A subcommittee of the nine directors plans to collect and review a number of documents for ideas, approaches, and developed forms for possible inclusion in a revised evaluation plan. The following documents will be reviewed:

- State Department of Education, Child Development Division - Program Quality Review (PQR).
- California Community Colleges - Guidelines for Comprehensive Child Development Instruction and Services Programs, 1983.
- National Association for the Education of the Young Child (NAEYC) — recently developed materials.
- The Governor's task force on child care -- recently developed materials.

In addition, the directors plan to focus on the classroom curriculum and arrange for more extensive input from the teaching faculty. They believe that involving two classroom instructors as members of the last evaluation team was a good start but only that.

The directors also wish to focus on identifying in explicit terms just what "program quality" means. Finally, they plan to work on operational definitions of other key words.

CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER PHILOSOPHY

The educational philosophy of the Los Angeles Community College District is "That each individual should have the opportunity to develop to his/her greatest potential". The Campus Child Development Centers of the Los Angeles Community College District share that philosophical goal.

The children's program is based on the philosophy that children learn by "doing", and that each child is unique, with his/her own separate needs, feelings, and backgrounds. The things that make each child different also make each child special.

In learning to live with himself/herself and develop relationships with others, the young child must first have a positive self concept. The faculty helps children conceive of themselves as people who can make choices, solve problems, discover the world around them, grow in independence, and relate to other people effectively.

The curriculum is designed to encourage each child to develop at his/her own speed and to attempt new challenges when he/she is ready. Interest centers permit children to explore the areas of art, construction, music and body movement, science, dramatic play, language and math experiences. Children select their own learning activities, enabling them to become wholly involved in thinking, feeling and doing at their own level of development.

The child's ability to deal with real objects gradually grows into the ability to deal with symbols, such as pictures, models and words.

The young child learns to use his body and the outdoor playground equipment provides many challenges for the child to try out new skills and to practice using his body in many ways.

Faculty members are selected for their professional training and experience, as well as their sensitivity to the needs of young children. The result is an atmosphere that is warm and open in which adults truly enjoy respect and relate positively to children.

CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The colleges of the Los Angeles Community College District have made accessibility to higher education a reality due to their proximity to the population served, low cost to students, and diversity of programs and services. The Campus Child Development Centers enhance that accessibility by providing low cost, high quality child development services for student-parents.

Children aged 2 1/2 - 5 years participate in a program designed to foster their cognitive, social, emotional, and physical development. A balanced curriculum is provided through learning centers, group and individual activities.

The Centers provide a vital instructional support service by acting as a field training site for observers, student-teachers and other trainees from various departments, including child development, psychology, physical education, nursing, speech, fine arts, and others.

Parent involvement is an integral part of the program. Courses in the college instructional program, parent-teacher conferencing, newsletters, group discussions, etcetera, strengthen parent skills and increase parent participation in a child's development.

The Campus Child Development Centers have become model programs that offer a supportive learning environment for students and children.

Furthermore, a preliminary cost-benefit analysis has indicated that the nine Child Development Center Programs generate additional ADA in that student parents report taking more classes than they would if the program did not exist. The analysis has shown the additional ADA income to be substantial.

THE EXTERNAL CONSULTANT'S PREFACE ON HOW TO READ THIS EVALUATION REPORT

There are two major ways in which the results of this Second Program Evaluation can be presented. The first is by showing the results for each of the program objectives and the second is by showing results for each of the nine colleges. Given this fact, this evaluation report is easily divided into these two major parts, with the first presenting results by program objective and the second presenting results by college.

For both parts a summary reporting system has been used, which, although it is clear to those who are familiar with the formatting, it may not be so clear to the casual reader. A brief description of how to read the summary notations is needed, especially for the first part.

As mentioned above, within the first part, results are shown by each of the program objectives. Each objective is divided into four units which are noted by the headings of the first four columns. The four units and columns correspond to the four parts of a measurable program objective — "Who", "Does What", "By When", and "How" the level of task accomplishment will be known. That is, each program objective includes: 1) Who is to do the task (identified on the page as "Person Responsible"), 2) What the task is (identified as "Task to be Performed"), 3) How the successful completion of the task will be measured (identified as "How Task Accomplishment will be Measured"), and 4) The date by which the task is to be completed (identified as "Date of Completion").

The remaining columns on pages in the first part provide information on the achievement level by each college on the objective presented on that page.

In addition to listing each college in alphabetical order, and presenting an answer to the question, "Was the objective attained?", the evaluation report writing team also wished to provide commendations, notations, comments, and recommendations where appropriate. This information is presented in the column at the far right.

Within the second part, evaluation results are presented for each of the nine colleges. This time each college received a page, whereas before each objective received a page. Each college's summary page shows the date of the on-site visit by the evaluation team; the names of the evaluation team members; a listing of the program objectives for which attainment levels were examined; a listing, by objective, of commendations, notations, comments, and recommendations, if any; a listing of those objectives that were found to be unattained, if any, plus commentary as needed; and finally, additional comments if needed.

As can be seen on the following pages, this second program evaluation (fall 1983-1984) was scaled down from the initial evaluation (spring 1981-1982). In the first evaluation, the attainment levels on all of the twenty (20) original program objectives were assessed. In the second evaluation, the attainment levels on six (6) objectives were assessed for each college; with four (4) of those selected by the Directors' Coordinating Committee (composed of all nine directors) and the remaining two (2) objectives selected by the individual centers' teaching faculty and director. Thus, in this second evaluation each center was responsible for six (6) selected program objectives.

The four (4) pre-selected objectives (objectives 3.2, 4.1, 5.1, and 6.1) were felt to be positive indicators of overall program effectiveness since many of the same items of evaluation data relied upon within those four (4) objectives were repeatedly relied upon within the original twenty (20) program objectives which comprised the original evaluation plan. The often relied upon items of evaluative data included: census reports, lesson plans, director's reports, and parent surveys. (Please see Appendix A for a copy of the Parent Survey and Appendix B for a copy of the Census Report.)

A district-level program evaluation plan of this magnitude presents a real challenge and it is usually expected that it could take at least two or three "iterations" before most people are satisfied that the objectives are comprehensive and of the highest quality.

Furthermore, time is usually needed for the major participants to revise, reshape, and improve the evaluation plan -- and make the document into one they really use and own.

The fact that evaluation teams again involved peers who again used objectives that were peer-developed, assisted in this regard. Also assisting in this improving and owning process is the fact that directors have again involved themselves in updating and revising the plan now that they have been through the peer review, on-site visit process twice. Further assisting, at least indirectly, in the improvement of this accountability system are the efforts of other organizations, many of which have recently provided documentation that the directors can review for possible incorporation into the next version of this program's Evaluation Plan. To be meaningful, an Evaluation Plan must become a "living" document; fortunately, the directors seem committed to making it so.

DEFINITIONS

The following terms are defined for clarification:

CCDC	Campus Child Development Center
CCDCDCC	Campus Child Development Center Director's Coordinating Committee
CCDC Faculty	Certificated personnel including Center Director and Instructors
CCDC Instructors	Certificated personnel working with the children and student assistants
Evaluation Team	The team which visited each of the nine center programs, conducted interviews, examined records, made observations and wrote this report. The team was composed of two directors (peer evaluators) one double site instructor, one single site instructor, and the county evaluation consultant.
Exemplary	Program of quality able to serve as a model of high professional standards

Field-Training Site. . . . . A site that offers supervised experience within which students learn through practical application

Practricum. . . . . Supervised student teaching in compliance with State requirements for Children's Center Permit

Observation. . . . . Supervised visitation to observe and/or record children's behavior. Possibly to fulfill course requirements

Lead Peer Evaluators. . . . . .CCDC directors who were members of the original Evaluation Plan writing team and who, during the first series of on-site evaluation team visits to campus programs, did lead in writing the evaluation report for the program being visited

Peer Evaluators. . . . . CCDC directors who were members of on-site evaluation teams that visited other campuses

Unmet Needs. . . . . Needs that have not been served by the existing program

PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS

BY

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 1.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will enhance accessibility to higher education and job training to the student-parent by providing early childhood education services.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
1.1 The Director	Will gather needed feedback information from parents regarding their characteristics, current status of their academic goal, number of hours of child care used by parents and added support provided by center.	a. Parent survey (Questionnaire item numbers 1-8, 11, 13, 21, 25	End of fall semester	CITY				
		b. Census report (Census report item numbers 2, 3, 7, 8)	Twice a semester	EAST				
				HARBOR				
				MISSION				
				PIERCE				
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T.				
				VALLEY				
				WEST				

Please Note:

None of the nine Campus Child Development Centers chose this program objective as one of their two center selected objectives, on which they wanted their Child Development Program evaluated.

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 1.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will enhance accessibility to higher education and job training to the student-parent by providing early childhood education services.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
1.2 The Director	Will collect information on the quantity of children's service hours and assess utilization levels as compared to student-parent needs.	a. Census report (Numbers 1-7) b. Waiting list c. Campus survey (optional)	Twice a semester Continuous As needed	CITY	X		100%	
				EAST				
				HARBOR				
				MISSION				
				PIERCE	X		100%	
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T.				
				VALLEY				
				WEST				

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 1.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will enhance accessibility to higher education and job training to the student-parent by providing early childhood education services.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
1.3 The Director and the CCDC Instructors, The district coordinator	Will encourage student-parents to enroll in instructional courses and persist throughout the semester.	a. Parent survey (Numbers 8-12, 14 15, 21) and /or	End of each semester	CITY				
		b. Given social security number the District Coordinator will complete data on units attempted, units completed, G.P.A.	As needed by District Coordinator	EAST				
				HARBOR				
				MISSION				Please Note: None of the nine Campus Child Development Centers chose this program objective as one of their two center selected objectives, on which they wanted their Chile Development Program evaluated.
				PIERCE				
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T.				
				VALLEY				
				WEST				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 1.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will enhance accessibility to higher education and job training to the student-parent by providing early childhood education services.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
1.1 The Director	Will estimate the increased unit load student-parents are enrolled in due to the availability of the Child Development Center Program	a. Gather and compare data from Parent survey (Numbers 11, 12)	End of fall semester	CITY				
				EAST				
				HARBOR				
				MISSION				
				PIERCE				
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T.				
				VALLEY				
				WEST				

Please Note:
None of the nine Campus Child Development Centers chose this program objective as one of their two center selected objectives, on which they wanted their Child Development Program evaluated.

18

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 2.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will assist college departments/ students by serving as a field training site for academic departments.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
2.1 The Director and the CCDC Instructors	**Will facilitate the use of the Center as a practicum for College students.**	a. Census report (Numbers 10, 12)	Twice a semester	CITY				
		b. Evaluation of practicum students where applicable	End of applicable semester	EAST				
		c. Observer/practicum attendance record or sign-in sheet.	End of applicable semester	HARBOR				
				MISSION				
				PIERCE	X		100%	b. Notation: Had attracted additional fieldwork students from West Valley Occupational Center and California State University at Northridge.
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T.				
				VALLEY				
				WEST				

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 2.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will assist college departments/ students by serving as a field training site for academic departments.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
2.2 The Director and the CCDC Instructors	Will facilitate the use of the Center as an observation site for college students.	a. Census report (Numbers 11, 13)	Twice a semester	CITY	X		100%	
		b. Observation/practicum attendance record/or sign-in sheet	End of applicable semester	EAST				
		c. Director's report (optional)	Continuous	HARBOR				
				MISSION	X		100%	
				PIERCE				
				S. WEST		X	10%	a. Comments: Census report was inaccurately filled out. b. Comments: Observer/practicum records were not current, 1981-1982 sign-in sheets. c. Comments: Monthly reports were submitted to the dean.
				TRADE T				
				VALLEY				
				WEST				

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 2.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will assist college departments/ students by serving as a field training site for academic departments.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	 NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
2.3 The Director and the CCDC Instructors	Will serve as a resource/liaison to the campus, departments, community, public and private organizations and agencies.	a. Census report (Numbers 9-12)	Twice a semester	CITY				
		b. Director's report (optional)	Continuous	EAST				
		c. Correspondence or	Continuous	HARBOR	X		100%	
		d. Calendar/Telephone log or	Continuous	MISSION				
		e. Publicity information	Continuous	PIERCE				
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T	X		100%	
				VALLEY				
				WEST				

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 3.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will function as an early childhood education program for children of college students.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
3.1 The Director and the CCDC Instructors	Will provide a learning environment conducive to developing cognitive, affective, social and physical growth.	a. Observational records or oral faculty interview b. CCDC Instructor's lesson plan or oral interview or c. Direct observation in classroom	Continuous Continuous Continuous	CITY				
				EAST	X		100%	a. Commendation: Site coordinator positions were an apparent asset to overall program management. b. Comment: Five different evaluation forms were available to be used.
				HARBOR				
				MISSION				
				PIERCE				
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T.				
				VALLEY				
				WEST				

22

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 3.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will function as an early childhood education program for children of college students.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED? YES	NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND\OR RECOMMENDATIONS
3.2 The CDCC Instructors	Will provide curriculum components in the following areas: a. language b. art c. music d. math e. science f. dramatic play g. large motor development h. small motor development i. social science j. personal development	a. CCDC Instructor's lesson plan (kept by instructor) or oral interview or b. Direct observation in classroom	Continuous Continuous	CITY	X		100%	b. Comment: Used a self-contained classroom structure in one building and an open structure in the other.
				EAST	X		100%	a. Notation: Had good lesson plans and oral interviews. b. Comment: Used a self-contained classroom structure. b. Comment: Used observer guidelines and sign-in sheets.
				HARBOR	X		100%	a. Notation: Used a good lesson-plan file (curriculum file box) as detailed backup to daily lesson plans. b. Commendation: Had a very good "Is it just play?" description board. c. Comment: Used an open structure with no age delination.
				MISSION	X		100%	a. Notation: Had good lesson plans. b. Comment: Used a self-contained classroom structure.
				PIERCE	X		100%	a. Notation: Had a unique lesson-plan format that appeared easy for practicum and substitutes to follow. b. Comment: Used a self-contained classroom structure.
				S. WEST		X	10%	a. Comment: Monthly thematic schedule was too broad to qualify for lesson plans. The committee disagreed with the acting director that weekly lesson plans are unnecessary. (See additional comments.) b. Comment: No learning from the classroom activities was observed. No activities were seen set up.
				TRADE T.	X		100%	a. Commendation: The lesson-plan board showed weekly activities that included objectives. b. Comment: Had a good a-sessment form.
				VALLEY	X		100%	a. Commendation: All curriculum components were well described and clear. It was a good example of a model practicum site. b. Comment: Used the self-contained classroom structure.
				WEST	X		100%	b. Comment: Had a good intake assessment form. b. Comment: Used an open structure format.

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 4.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will maintain an exemplary community college campus based child development center program.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED? YES	NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
4.1 The Director and the CDCC Instructors	Will maintain an exemplary field training site where students can learn through practical application, the theories taught in instructional programs.	a. Observer and practicum exit reports. b. Observer guidelines.	Continuous	CITY	X		100%	a. Comment: Had case studies of children done by psychology 82 students. b. Comment: Used observer guidelines and sign-in sheets.
				EAST	X		100%	b. Comment: Used observer guidelines and sign-in sheets.
				HARBOR	X		100%	b. Comment: Used observer guidelines and sign-in sheets.
				MISSION	X		100%	
				PIERCE	X		100%	a. Comment: Used a practicum evaluation (Psychology 81) form in conjunction with observer and practicum exit report. a. Commendation: Had a training film for students. b. Comment: Used observer guidelines and sign-in sheets.
				S. WEST	X		100%	
				TRADE T.	X		100%	
				VALLEY	X		100%	a. Commendation: Had a good observation form for the Child Development 52 class. b. Comment: Used observer guidelines and sign-in sheets. c. Comment: CCDC staff was affectively integrated into many on-campus instructional departments.
				WEST	X		100%	

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 4.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will maintain an exemplary community college campus based child development center program.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
4.2 The Director and the CCDC Instructors	Will provide an exemplary Early Childhood Education program focused on affective, cognitive, social and motor competencies.	a. CCDC faculty records/lesson plans.	Continuous	CITY				
		b. Children's developmental record or observation.	Continuous	EAST				
		c. Record of parent-instructor conference.	Continuous	HARBOR				
		d. Parent Survey (Numbers 22, 25)	End of fall semester	MISSION				
		e. Student-parent exit survey	End of each semester	PIERCE				
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T.				
				VALLEY	X		100%	b. Commendation: Had a good child abuse report packet. c. Notation: Parent resources were well organized and presented.
				WEST				

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 4.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will maintain an exemplary community college campus based child development center program.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
4.3 The Director and the CCDC Instructors	Will provide growth opportunities for CCDC faculty and staff	a. Professional participation and activities	Continuous	CITY				
		b. Staff Handbook or Guidelines	Continuous	EAST				
		c. Staff meetings	Continuous	HARBOR				
		d. Director's report (optional)	Continuous	MISSION				
				PIERCE				
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T.				
				VALLEY	X		100%	a. Notation: Had a good documentation of professional participation by the campus child development center staff.
				WEST				

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 5.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will offer a parent involvement program which would enhance parenting skills.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
5.1 The Director and the CCDC Instructors	Will keep parents informed of Center program, policies and other pertinent information.	a. Parent survey (Numbers 21, 27) b. Orientation or Intake Interview records. c. Parent Handbook d. Parent newsletter or e. Bulletin boards.	End of fall semester Continuous Continuous Continuous Continuous	CITY	X		100%	
				EAST	X		100%	d. Notation: The coordinators provided thorough, effective communication. e. Notation: Had a good parent information board. f. Comment: Had a parent advisory committee and has made parent meetings mandatory.
				HARBOR	X		100%	e. Commendation: Had a very good job board. g. Comment: Had a parent participation program.
				MISSION	X		100%	n. Commendation: The director met the need for parent orientation and conferencing by doing home visits when the parent(s) could not come to the center.
				PIERCE		X	85%	a. Comment: Did not use current form. f. Comment: Parent Advisory Committee composed of Parent, Faculty and Community.
				S. WEST		X	15%	a. Comment: Inadequate information provided. b. Comment: Inadequate information provided c. Comment: No handbook available. d. Comment: Minimal information available. e. Comment: Minimal information available.
				TRADE T.	X		100%	b. Comment: Used a self-contained classroom with open structure time. c. Notation: Used a good handbook format. c. Notation: Had a good parent and child service brochure.
				VALLEY	X		100%	
				WEST	X		100%	b. Commendation: Used an orientation video tape for parents

27

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 5.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will offer a parent involvement program which would enhance parenting skills.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
5.2 The Director and the CCDC Instructors	Will involve the parents in their children's development.	a. Discussion/rap groups or lecturer	Continuous	CITY				
		b. Parent meeting or	Continuous	EAST				
		c. Parent-instructors conferences or	Continuous					
		d. Parent participation	Continuous	HARBOR	X		100%	d. Comment: A.S.O. matched parent fundraiser donation. d. Comment: Had an 8 hr/mo. parent participation policy.
		e. Parent survey (Numbers 22, 26)	End of fall semester	MISSION	X		100%	c. Comment: Had a weekly parent information handout.
		f. Student-parent exit survey	End of each semester	PIERCE				
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T.	X		100%	c. Comment: Used parent conference guidelines.
				VALLEY				
				WEST				

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 5.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will offer a parent involvement program which would enhance parenting skills.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
5.3 The Director, and the CCDC Instructors.	Will provide support to student-parents which will assist them in attaining their family and academic goals.	a. Parent survey (Numbers 8-15, 21, 25) b. Student-parents exit survey	End of fall semester End of each semester.	CITY				
				EAST				
				HARBOR				
				MISSION				Please Note: None of the nine Campus Child Development Centers chose this program objective as one of their two center selected objectives, on which they wanted their Chile Development Program evaluated.
				PIERCE				
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T.				
				VALLEY				
				WEST				

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 6.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will expand and enhance existing child development services.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
6.1 The Director	Will design and implement a Campus Child Development Center Master. Plan at the Campus level.	a. Master plan or b. Annual report or c. Measures of Effectiveness Evaluation plan.	Once a year June	CITY	X	100%		
				EAST	X	100%		
				HARBOR	X	100%		
				MISSION	X	100%		
				PIERCE	X	100%		
				S. WEST	X	100%		
				TRADE T.	X	100%		
				VALLEY	X	100%		
				WEST	X	100%		

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 6.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will expand and enhance existing child development services.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
6.2 The Director	Will identify unmet student-parents needs.	a. Parent Survey (Numbers 23, 24)	End of fall semester	CITY				
		b. Waiting lists or	Continuous	EAST				
		c. Phone tally	Continuous	HARBOR				
		d. Student-parent exit survey	End of each semester	MISSION				
				PIERCE				
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T.				
				VALLEY				
				WEST				

Please Note

None of the nine Campus Child Development Centers chose this program objective as one of their two center selected objectives, on which they wanted their Child Development Program evaluated.

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 6.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will expand and enhance existing child development services.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
6.3 The Director and the CCDC Instructors	**May explore alternate solutions to meet student-parent needs.**	a. Correspondence or	Continuous	CITY				
		b. Meeting minutes or	Continuous					
		c. Grants and proposals	Continuous	EAST	X		100%	c. Notation: Had a nutrition, education, and training gr a grant for special need children-bilingual curriculum material; and an after school, school-age child care g from child care food program.
		d. Director's report (optional)	Continuous					d. Commendation: Implementated a Community Services prog adding child spaces, increasing staff and supply funds.
				HARBOR				
				MISSION				
				PIERCE				
				S. WEST	X		100%	c. Comment: Submitted expansion application for child ca d. Comment: Submitted monthly reports to the dean.
				TRADE T.				
				VALLEY				
				WEST				

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 6.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will expand and enhance existing child development services.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED YES	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
6.4 The Director and the CCDC Instructors	May implement new and additional programs.	a. Waiting list or b. Observe program or c. Parent Survey (Numbers 23, 24) or d. Grants and proposals. e. Correspondence		CITY				
				EAST				
				HARBOR				
				MISSION				
				PIERCE				
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T.				
				VALLEY				
				WEST	X		100%	a. Comment: Converted to session from flexible scheduling. b. Comment: Had an evening program. c. Comment: Implemented a food program.

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GOAL 6.0 The Districtwide Child Development Program will expand and enhance existing child development services.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TASK TO BE PERFORMED / TASK	HOW TASK ACCOMPLISHMENT WILL BE MEASURED / MEASURE	DATE TO BE COMPLETED / DATE	COLLEGE	WAS OBJECTIVE ATTAINED? YES	NO	LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT	COMMENDATIONS, NOTATIONS, COMMENTS, AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS
6.5 The Director and the CCDC Instructors	Will integrate the Child Development Centers into campus-wide activities	a. Correspondence or b. Annual report c. Director's report (optional)	Continuous Continuous June	CITY				
				EAST				
				HARBOR				
				MISSION				
				PIERCE				
				S. WEST				
				TRADE T.				
				VALLEY				
				WEST				a. Comment: Center participated in college participation Week, and foregin language week. b. Comment: Beautiful junk campaign utilized campus resources.

PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS

BY

COLLEGE

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
BY-COLLEGE EVALUATION RESULTS

EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE
Date of on-site visit: November 9, 1983

Evaluation Team Members:

1. Alice Hernandez, director, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Mission College.
2. Dr. Donald Kester, consultant, Program Evaluation, Los Angeles County Office of Education.
3. Michael Simone, director, Campus Child Development Center, East Los Angeles College.

Attendee: Dr. Roberto Almonza, dean of administration, East Los Angeles College.

Program Objectives Reviewed

3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, and 6.3

Objective No:	Commendations, Notations, Comments, Recommendations
3.1	a. Commendation: Site coordinator positions were an apparent asset to overall program management.
	b. Comment: Five different evaluation forms were available to be used.
3.2	a. Notation: Had good lesson plans and oral interviews.
	b. Comment: Used a self-contained classroom structure.
4.1	b. Comment: Used observer guidelines and sign-in sheets.
5.1	d. Notation: The coordinators provided thorough, effective communication.
	e. Notation: Had a good parent information board.
	f. Comment: Had a parent advisory committee and has made parent meetings mandatory.

6.3 c. Notation: Had a nutrition, education, and training grant; a grant for special need children - bilingual curriculum material; and an after school, school-age child care grant from C.D.D. food program.

c. Commendation: Implemented a community services program that added child spaces and increased staff and supply funds.

Unattained Objectives: None - Measurement: None - Commentary: None

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
BY-COLLEGE EVALUATION RESULTS

LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE
Date of on-site Evaluation visit: November 3, 1983

Evaluation Team Members:

1. Alice Hernandez, director, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Mission College.

2. Dr. Donald Kester, consultant, Program Evaluation, Los Angeles County Office of Education.

3. Kathy Lally, instructor, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Pierce College.

4. Michael Simone, director, Campus Child Development Center, East Los Angeles College.

Program Objectives Reviewed

1.2, 2.2, 3.2, 4.1, 5.1, and 6.1

Objective No.	Commendations, Notations, Comments, Recommendations
3.2	b. Comment: Used a self-contained classroom structure in one building and used an open structure in the other.
4.1	a. Comment: Had case studies of children done by psychology 82 students.
	b. Comment: Used observer guidelines and sign-in sheets.

Unattained Objectives: None - Measurement: None - Commentary: None

Additional Comments

It should be noted that the permanent director was on leave at the time of the on-site visit by the peer review team.

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
BY-COLLEGE EVALUATION RESULTS

LOS ANGELES HARBOR COLLEGE
Date of on-site Evaluation visit: November 1, 1983

Evaluation Team Members:

1. Karen Carfagna, instructor, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College.

2. Alice Hernandez, director, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Mission College.

3. Dr. Donald Kester, consultant, Program Evaluation, Los Angeles County Office of Education.

4. Michael Simone, director, Campus Child Development Center, East Los Angeles College.

Program Objectives Reviewed

3.2, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, and 6.3

Objective No.	Commendations, Notations, Comments, Recommendations
3.2	a. Notation: Used a good lesson-plan file (curriculum file box) as detailed backup to daily lesson plans.
	b. Commendation: Had a very good "Is it just play?" description board.
	b. Comment: Used an open structure with no age delineation.
4.1	b. Comment: Used observer guidelines and sign-in sheets.
5.1	e. Commendation: Had a very good job board.
	g. Comment: Had a parent participation program.
5.2	d. Comment: A.S.O. matched parent fundraiser donation.
	d. Comment: Had an 8 hr./mo. parent participation policy.

Unattained Objectives: None - Measurement: None - Commentary: None

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
BY-COLLEGE EVALUATION RESULTS

LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE
Date of on-site Evaluation visit: October 25, 1983

Evaluation Team Members:

1. Karen Carfagna, instructor, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College.
2. Alice Hernandez, director, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Mission College.
3. Dr. Donald Kester, consultant, Program Evaluation, Los Angeles County Office of Education.
4. Michael Simone, director, Campus Child Development Center, East Los Angeles College.

Program Objectives Reviewed

2.2, 3.2, 4.1, 5.1, 5.2, and 6.1

Objective No.	Commendations, Notations, Comments, Recommendations
3.2	a. Notation: Had good lesson plans.
	b. Comment: Used a self-contained classroom structure.
5.1	b. Commendation: The director met the need for parent orientation and conferencing by doing home visits when the parent(s) could not come to the center.
5.2	c. Comment: Had a weekly parent information handout.

Unattained Objectives: None - Measurement: None - Commentary: None

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
BY-COLLEGE EVALUATION RESULTS

LOS ANGELES PIERCE COLLEGE
Date of on-site Evaluation visit: November 15, 1983

Evaluation Team Members:

1. Alice Hernandez, director, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Mission College.
2. Dr. Donald Kester, consultant, Program Evaluation, Los Angeles County Office of Education.
3. Kathy Lally, instructor, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Pierce College.
4. Michael Simone, director, Campus Child Development Center, East Los Angeles College.

Program Objectives Reviewed

1.2, 2.1, 3.2, 4.1, 5.1, and 6.1

Objective No.	Commendations, Notations, Comments, Recommendations
2.1	b. Notation: Had attracted additional fieldwork students from West Valley Occupational Center and California State University at Northridge.
3.2	a. Notation: Had a unique lesson-plan format that appeared easy for practicum and substitutes to follow.
	b. Comment: Used a self-contained classroom structure.
4.1	a. Comment: Used a practicum evaluation (Psychology 81) form in conjunction with observer and practicum exit report.
	a. Commendation: Had a training film for students.
	b. Comment: Used observer guidelines and sign-in sheets.

Unattained Objectives	Measurement	Commentary
5.1 Will keep parents informed of Center program, policies, and other pertinent information.	a. Parent survey (#21, #27)	a. Did not use current form.
	b. Orientation or Intake Interview records.	b. Had records.
	c. Parent Handbook.	c. Had Handbook.
	d. Parent newsletter, or	e. Used bulletin boards.
	e. Bulletin boards.	f. Had parent advisory committee composed of parents, faculty, and community.
	f. Parent meetings.	

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
BY-COLLEGE EVALUATION RESULTS

LOS ANGELES SOUTHWEST COLLEGE
Date of on-site Evaluation visit: November 8, 1983

Evaluation Team Members:

1. Alice Hernandez, director, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Mission College.
2. Dr. Donald Kester, consultant, Program Evaluation, Los Angeles County Office of Education.
3. Kathy Lally, instructor, Campus Child Care Development Center, Los Angeles Pierce College.
4. Michael Simone, director, Campus Child Care Development Center, East Los Angeles College.

Program Objectives Reviewed

2.2, 3.2, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, and 6.3

Objective No.	Commendations, Notations, Comments, Recommendations
6.3	a. Comment: Submitted expansion application for child care.
	d. Comment: Submitted monthly reports to the dean.

Unattained Objectives	Measurement	Commentary
2.2 Will facilitate the use of the Center as an observation site for college students.	a. Census report (#11, # 13).	a. Census report was inaccurately filled out.
	b. Observation/ practicum attendance record/or sign-in sheet.	b. Observer/practicum records were not current, 1981-82 sign-in sheets. (See additional comments next page.)
	c. Director's report (optional).	c. Monthly reports were submitted to the dean.

3.2 Will provide curriculum components in the following areas: a. language b. art c. music d. math e. science f. dramatic play g. large motor development h. small motor development i. social science j. personal development	a.	CCDC Instructor's lesson-plan (kept by instructor) or oral interview or	a. Monthly thematic schedule too broad to qualify for lesson plans. The committee disagreed with the acting director that weekly lesson plans are unnecessary. (See additional comments below.)
	b.	Direct observation in classroom.	b. No learning from classroom activities was observed. No activities were seen set up.
5.1 Will keep parents informed of Center program, policies and other pertinent information.	a.	Parent survey (#21, #27).	a. Inadequate information was provided.
	b.	Orientation or Intake Interview records.	b. Inadequate information was provided.
	c.	Parent Handbook,	c. No handbook was available.
	d.	Parent newsletter or	d. Minimal information was available.
	e.	Bulletin boards.	e. Minimal information was available

Additional Comments

The peer review evaluation team was unable to evaluate a learning program for the children at Los Angeles Southwest College's Child Development Center because of the fact that, during the on-site visit, the team did not observe the following key forms of evidence:

1. children actively involved in classroom learning activities,

2. evidence of preparation or set-up of classroom learning activities to be used later that day, or

3. sufficiently detailed lesson plans which would show weekly plans for the development of children's learning activities.

It should be noted that the permanent director was on leave at the time of the on-site visit by the peer review evaluation team.

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY DISTRICT
CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
BY-COLLEGE EVALUATION RESULTS

LOS ANGELES TRADE-TECHNICAL COLLEGE
Date of on-site Evaluation visit: October 26, 1983

Evaluation Team Members:

1. Karen Carfagna, instructor, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College.

2. Alice Hernandez, director, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Mission College.

3. Dr. Donald Kester, consultant, Progrm Evaluation, Los Angeles County Office of Education.

4. Michael Simone, director, Campus Child Development Center, East Los Angeles College.

Attendee:

Ray Garay, dean of student services, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College.

Program Objectives Reviewed

2.3, 3.2, 4.1, 5.1, 5.2, and 6.1

Objective No.	Commendations, Notations, Comments, Recommendations
3.2	a. Commendation: The lesson-plan board showed weekly activities that included objectives.
	b. Comment: Had a good assessment form.
5.1	b. Comment: Self-contained classroom with open structure time.
	c. Notation: Used a good handbook format.
	c. Notation: Had a good parent and child service brochure.
5.2	c. Comment: Used parent conference guidelines.

Unattained Objectives: None - Measurement: None - Commentary: None

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
BY-COLLEGE EVALUATION RESULTS

LOS ANGELES VALLEY COLLEGE
Date of on-site Evaluation visit: November 29, 1983

Evaluation Team Members:

1. Alice Hernandez, director, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Mission College.
2. Dr. Donald Kester, consultant, Program Evaluation, Los Angeles County Office of Education.
3. Kathy Lally, instructor, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Pierce College.
4. Michael Simone, director, Campus Child Development Center, East Los Angeles College.

Program Objectives Reviewed

3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, and 6.1

Objective No.	Commendations, Notations, Comments, Recommendations
3.2	a. Commendation: all curriculum components were well described and clear. It was a good example of a model practicum site.
	b. Comment: Used the self-contained classroom structure.
4.1	a. Commendation: Had a good observation form for the CD52 class.
	b. Comment: Used observer guidelines and sign-in sheets.
	c. Notation: CCDC staff was effectively integrated into many on-campus instructions departments.
4.2	b. Commendation: Had a good child abuse report packet.
	c. Notation: Parent resources were well organized and presented.
4.3	a. Notation: Had good documentation of professional participation by the Campus Child Development Center staff.

Unattained Objectives: None - Measurement: None - Commentary: None

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
BY-COLLEGE EVALUATION RESULTS

WEST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE
Date of on-site Evaluation visit: October 27, 1983

Evaluation Team Members:

1. Alice Hernandez, director, Campus Child Development Center, Los Angeles Mission College.
2. Dr. Donald Kester, consultant, Program Evaluation, Los Angeles County Office of Education.
3. Michael Simone, director, Campus Child Development Center, East Los Angeles College.

Program Objectives Reviewed:

3.2, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 6.4, and 6.5

Objective No.	Commendations, Notations, Comments, Recommendations
3.2	b. Comment: Had a good intake assessment form.
	b. Comment: Used an open structure format.
5.1	b. Notation: Used an orientation video tape for parents.
6.4	a. Comment: Converted to session from flexible scheduling.
	b. Comment: Had an evening program.
	c. Comment: Implemented a food program.
6.5	a. Comment: Center participated in college appreciation week and foreign language week.
	a. Comment: Beautiful junk campaign utilized campus resources.

Unattained Objectives: None - Measurement: None - Commentary: None

SUMMARY

The results of the on-site evaluation team visits can be summarized in two ways, one of which is very objective, while the other is somewhat subjective. In the very objective instance, results can be summarized on the number of objectives attained at each of the nine campuses. As will soon be seen, the average program objective attainment level was extremely high --94.8% to be exact, with seven of the nine colleges scoring 100%. In the somewhat subjective instance, results can be summarized on the number of commendations and notations given to each college's program. As will soon be seen, the evaluation teams gave their highest subjective rating, a "commendation"; an average campus program was awarded only 1.2 commendations. They gave their second highest subjective rating, a "notation"almost as infrequently; an average campus program received only 1.3 notations. The committee was the most generous with its distribution of "comments" in that the average college program received 5.0 of those. But this average is misleading since "comments" were sometimes positive, sometimes negative, and sometimes neutral in tone.

By its very nature, this management-by-objectives evaluation system places a heavy emphasis on program objective attainment. The original writing team spent many person-days working to produce the goals and measurable objectives that make up this evaluation system. In addition, the district-level Campus Child Development Coordinating Committee also spent a large number of person-days in reviewing and revising the goals and objectives. It is accurate to say that all CCDC directors had direct input into the formulation of the final set of goals and objectives that were the primary basis of this evaluation. In this manner, the peer-review system gained consensus on the "rules" of the evaluation "upfront" from everyone.

This could be one reason why the objective attainment levels were so high. The attainment levels are shown in Table 1, on the following page.

TABLE I

INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM OBJECTIVE ATTAINMENT

LEVELS FOR ALL NINE CCDC PROGRAMS

	NUMBER OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES		
COLLEGE	ATTEMPTED	ATTAINED	% ATTAINED
EAST LOS ANGELES	6	6	100%
LOS ANGELES CITY	6	6	100%
LOS ANGELES HARBOR	6	6	100%
LOS ANGELES MISSION	6	6	100%
LOS ANGELES PIERCE	6	5.85	97.5%
LOS ANGELES SOUTHWEST	6	3.35	55.8%
LOS ANGELES TRADE-TECHNICAL	6	6	100%
LOS ANGELES VALLEY	6	6	100%
WEST LOS ANGELES	6	6	100%
DISTRICT-WIDE AVERAGE	6	5.69	94.8%

Most of us do not usually operate at 90% efficiency. When managers run programs that operate at such highly efficient levels they surely deserve to be complimented and recognized for their achievements. As this report goes to press, it is a fact that many educational programs are loosely defined and loosely administered. The objective summary of this MOE evaluation of the CCDC program shows that educational programs can be more precisely defined and more objectively administered and evaluated.

As mentioned, the peer evaluation system also included a somewhat subjective rating scheme. The peers, with input from the other evaluation team members, provided commendations and notations when they thought the program being reviewed deserved special recognition. It was through the use of commendations and notations that the peer directors and instructors were able

to recognize a program that had, in their opinion, gone beyond simply meeting the letter of the objective. The giving of a commendation was the equivalent of saying, "Your program did not just meet the objective, it was 'outstanding'; or 'excellent' on this objective." If a commendation was the equivalent of a rating of "excellent", a notation was the equivalent of a rating of "very good; please note this". Another way of thinking about this subjective rating system would be to consider a "commendation" as equivalent to a grade of "A" and a "notation" as equivalent to a grade of "B".

It should be mentioned that while the addition of the subjective rating for "over-and-above" production was important, it was also important that directors and instructors have this subjective assessment done by their peers. This conclusion was reached when the following question and answer emerged: "Who can best provide a subjective rating of over-and-above quality?" "A group of our own CCDC directors and instructors."

A summary of the granting of commendations, notations, and comments is shown below in Table II.

TABLE II

INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM RECEIPT OF COMMENDATIONS,
NOTATIONS, AND COMMENTS FOR ALL NINE CCDC PROGRAMS

COLLEGE	NUMBER OF		
	COMMENTS	NOTATIONS	COMMENDATIONS
EAST LOS ANGELES	5	4	2
LOS ANGELES CITY	3	0	0
LOS ANGELES HARBOR	5	1	2
LOS ANGELES MISSION	2	1	1
LOS ANGELES PIERCE	5	2	1
LOS ANGELES SOUTHWEST	12	0	0
LOS ANGELES TRADE-TECHNICAL	3	2	1
LOS ANGELES VALLEY	3	2	3
WEST LOS ANGELES	7	0	1
AVERAGE	5	1.3	1.2

CONCLUSION

The Measures of Effectiveness project began in the spring of 1981 at the request of the district. This report is for the second evaluation conducted in the fall semester of 1983.

The Campus Child Development Center Directors' Coordinating Committee, wanting to make use of existing data and wanting to know where new data were needed, used this project as an opportunity to tie it all together. They discovered along the way that there were data they wanted to see collected that were not being collected. Consequently, forms were created to obtain those data. They also were able to see areas that needed improvement, and took steps to do so.

From the conception, the committee worked smoothly, fitting together all the details. Those involved are extremely pleased with the document. The first on-site evaluations were used as a pilot situation to see how well the Centers had organized the materials for the management-by-objectives evaluation system. The second evaluation was a modification of the first in that six (6) pre-selected, high priority objectives were reviewed instead of the entire twenty (20) objectives. The visitations were an educational process for all concerned; the Deans, the Directors, and even the writing teams learned from the experience. When the Centers were opened, there was an evaluation plan, but it became outdated very quickly. This "Measures of Effectiveness" document has had more longevity and flexibility. This evaluation plan has been revised following both evaluations to provide for greater accuracy in the measurements. The members of the Coordinating Committee wanted the evaluation plan to allow for individuality and campus autonomy, yet provide consistency within the district for the program. It is felt that this has been accomplished.

The Measures of Effectiveness evaluation system provides a plan that is valuable, not only for use in better defining the job descriptions of the Center faculty, but also for use in better fiscal planning for the programs. No doubt the next revision will produce an even better evaluation plan and set of peer review procedures.

Dr. Donald Kester was extremely valuable in suggesting the basic format, and keeping the writing and rewriting teams on the right track. He served as a very valuable resource and we are grateful to Dr. Gordon Footman and Dr. Tom Bishop of the Los Angeles County Office of Education for making his services available to our program. We thank Dr. Kester for his sincere interest in our program, and especially appreciate the fact that he served on both the initial and the second on-site evaluation teams.

The outcome of this second evaluation provides evidence in keeping with the initial evaluation results. They both show that the Campus Child Development Centers really are continuing to accomplish the task that the district initially intended. The information contained in this report adds a measure of public accountability and validity to the good work that is being done at the campuses.

APPENDIX A

College _____ Date _____

Los Angeles Community College District
Campus Child Development Center

Parent Survey

1. Zip Code _____

2. Age of Student-Parent _____

3. Ethnic Background of Student-Parent (Check one)

(1) Black/Afro American ____
(2) Chicano
Mexican-American
Hispanic ____
(3) White/Caucasian ____
(4) Asian/Pacific Islander ____
(5) American Indian ____
Alaskan Native ____
(6) Filipino ____
(7) Other ____
(8) Decline to State ____

4. Sex of Student-Parent: Female _____ Male _____

5. Number of persons in your family (including you) _____

6. Are you a single-parent family? Yes _____ No _____

7. Family Income:

A. Sources (Multiple response possible)		B. Level Gross monthly income	
S. S. ____	Child Support ____	$500 or less	____
A. F. D. C. ____	Alimony ____	$501 - $700	____
Veteran ____	Other (List)	$701 - $900	____
Financial Aids ____	_____	$901 - $1,500	____
Employment ____	_____	Over $1,501	____

8. Academic Major/Vocational Goal _____

9. What is your most important reason for attending College ? (Check one)

(1) To gain job skills ____
(2) To transfer to 4 yr. college ____
(3) To get AA or vocational credential ____
(4) Self-improvement ____
(5) Hobby/recreation ____
(6) To improve English ____
(7) Other, please state _____

10. What educational background do you have?

A. Units Completed (Check one)		B. Degrees Completed (Check one)	
Less than 12 units	____	Credential	____
12 - 29 units	____	A. A.	____
30 - 59 units	____	B. A.	____
60 or over	____	Masters or Higher	____
		None	____

11. How many units are you taking this semester? _____

12. Number of units you would be taking if there were no Campus Child Development Center _____

13. Number of hours per week that you use the Campus Child Development Center _____

14. What do you see as your greatest obstacle to completion of your academic/vocational goal? (Multiple response possible)

Money ____
Child Care ____
Personal Time ____
Studying ____
Housing ____
Family ____
Other, please state _____

15. If the Campus Child Development Center were not available, what would you do? (Multiple response possible)

Drop out of school _____ Find other child care _____
Reduce class load _____ Reduce study time _____
Take your child to class _____ Other _____

16. How many children do you have attend the Center? _____

17. My hourly rate at the Center is (Check one)

No fee (Valley & East only) ____ 25¢ ____ 40¢ ____ 75¢ ____ $1 ____

18. If this rate were doubled, would you still be able to afford the Child Development Center services? Yes _____ No _____

19. Does your community offer affordable child care to meet your needs while enrolled in college? Yes _____ No _____ Not known _____

20. Does your community offer quality child care equal to the Campus Child Development Center? Yes _____ No _____ Not known _____

21. In addition to child care, how has the Center helped you? (Multiple response possible)

Academic Support _____ Help in understanding child's development _____
Referral to financial aid _____ Referral to Counseling Service _____
Personal Support _____ Referral to off-campus services _____
Health information _____ Other, please state _____
Assistance in expanding parenting skills _____ _____

22. How has the Center involved you in your child's development? _____

_____

_____

23. Would you be interested in additional Child Development Center Services for: (Multiple response possible)

Evening _____ Other _____
Infant _____ Toddler _____ School Age Children _____

24. What could the Campus Child Development Center do to improve its existing service to you? (Multiple response possible)

Provide lunch _____ Longer hours _____ Other _____
Provide transportation _____ Satisfied, no change _____

25. How has the Center helped your child? _____

_____

26. How have you participated in the Center's parent involvement program?

_____

27. Do you feel the Center keeps you informed of its programs and policies?

_____

28. Comments: _____

_____

_____

LACCD Child Development Center
Coordinating Committee
5/80
Revised: 2/81, 10/81

APPENDIX B

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Enrollment Report
(Census)

College _____

Census Week of _____

Semester, year _____

1. Number of children enrolled week of census _____
2. Weekly child hours served: am_____ pm_____ all day _____ total hours _____
3. Weekly child hours available: am_____ pm _____ all day_____ total hours _____
4. Number dropped since beginning of semester _____
5. Number added since beginning of semester _____
6. Total number on waiting list for this semester _____
7. Total number of student-parents during week of census _____
8. Total number of single student-parents during week of census _____
9. Volunteers hours for week _____
10. Practicum LACCD student hours for week _____
11. Observer LACCD student hours for week _____
12. Non-LACCD participating student hours for week _____
13. Non-LACCD observer hours for week _____

Census weeks:
October 4-8, 1982
November 22-26, 1982

YH/bc

cc: Ancheta
Farjardo - District
Simone, East

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges
FEB 20 1987